



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/603,497	02/20/96	MORINI	G US-12001+2+3

15M2/1219

JOANNE L. HORN  
MONTELL NORTH AMERICA INC  
LAW DEPARTMENT  
P O BOX 15439  
WILMINGTON DE 19850-5439

EXAMINER

SMITH, E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1505

18

DATE MAILED:

12/19/97

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF  
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**MAILED**

**DEC 19 1997**

**GROUP 1500**

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 18

Serial Number: 08/603,497  
Filing Date:  
Appellant(s): Morini et al.

James C. Lydon  
For Appellants

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to appellants' brief on appeal filed  
October 3, 1997.

***(1) Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is  
contained in the brief.

***(2) Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and  
interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected  
by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is  
contained in the brief.

***(3) Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the  
brief is correct.

Art Unit 1505

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellants' statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

The amendment after final rejection filed on October 3, 1997 has been entered.

**(5) Summary of Invention**

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Issues**

The appellants' statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) Grouping of Claims**

The rejection of claims 1-6, 8-20 and 22-29 stand or fall together because appellants' brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

**(8) Claims Appealed**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

5,122,492	Albizzati (492)	6/92
5,068,213	Albizzati (213)	11/91
4,978,648	Barbe	12/90
2-242,804 (Japan)	Denko	9/90

Art Unit 1505

*(11) Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims.

Claims 1-6, 8-20 and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albizzati (492), Albizzati (213) and Barbe altogether or all in view of Denko.

Albizzati (213) generically teaches the use of the claimed diethers as external electron donors in the claimed titanium component (column 2, lines 3-8, lines 54-60). While this description does not specifically state that the ring formed from bonding the X and the Y radicals can be unsaturated, this recitation along with that at column 2 lines 3-8 suggests that this ring could have a plurality of double bonds. It is certainly clear that the recitation at column 2, lines 3-8 (as well as claim 1 of this patent) generically includes the claimed diethers.

Since Albizzati (492) (column 4, lines 17-20) and Barbe (column 3, lines 7-11) teach some analogous compounds of Albizzati (213) not containing any unsaturation, e.g., 1,1-bis(methoxymethyl)-cyclohex<sup>a</sup>ene, -bicyclo[2,2,1]heptane and -cyclopentane (Albizzati (492), column 4, lines 17-20) it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to realize that the analogous compounds containing a plurality of unsaturation in the

Art Unit 1505

ring would make suitable diethers for use in the catalyst of these references, e.g., a cyclopentadiene ring.

The motivation to realize that diethers having multiunsaturated cyclic rings in place of the saturated cyclic rings would also be suitable ethers for the catalysts of the reference is supplied by Denko who teaches that the analogous 1,1-diethers having a cyclopentadiene ring attached to both of the oxygen atoms is a suitable diether for the same use as the claimed diethers.

The embodiments of the remaining claims are either disclosed by the references or obvious therefrom.

Contrary to appellants' allegations, one would be motivated to modify the cyclic group containing diethers of Albizzati (492) by the teaching of Albizzati (213) and by the teachings of Denko.

Appellants continually urge that these cyclic group containing diethers disclosed by the references are "non-preferred" and thus teach "away" from the invention diethers. While they are obviously not the preferred species, they are taught to be suitable and must be considered in evaluating the patentability of the claims. In re Miller et al. 176 USPQ 196.

Serial No. 08/603,497

-5-

Art Unit 1505

CONCLUSION

Appellants' appeal should be denied because the art of record establishes a prima facie case of obviousness which has not been rebutted.

EJSmith:cdc  
(703) 308-2351  
December 17, 1997

James C. Lydon  
Adduci, Mastriani & Schaumberg  
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 250  
Washington, D.C. 20036

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Edward J. Smith", written in a cursive style.

EDWARD J. SMITH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 155